

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

RE: THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42 have been amended to more clearly recite the (column) item titles as (column) item category titles that identify respective categories of the data segments.

In addition, claims 30 and 33 have been amended to correct a minor grammatical informality of which the undersigned has become aware.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42 be approved and entered.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that the amendments to the claims are clarifying in nature only, and do not narrow the scope of the claims either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

RE: THE SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS

The specification has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the term "item category title." Clearly, no new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

amendments to the specification be approved and entered, and that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

RE: THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112

In item 1 on page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner refers to pages 21-23 of the specification and asserts that "column items" as defined to in the specification may correspond to, for example, "Chris," "New York" or "408-228-6611."

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the data referred to by the Examiner corresponds to data that might be entered in one row of one column item. That is, "Chris" might be an entry in one row in the column item "name;" "New York" might be an entry in one row in the column item "state;" and "408-228-6611" might be an entry in one row in the column item "phone." And it is respectfully pointed out that the disclosure in the specification at pages 21-23 clearly explains that column items refer to categories of data rather than particular segments of data.

For example, the specification explains at page 21, lines 8-16 that:

The database is encrypted using a column key and a row key. That is, when a column item frequently used in a retrieving process comprises 'name', 'state', and 'age', the data of each row of the column item is encrypted using a column key common among column items such as the 'apple', 'orange',

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

'lemon', etc. as shown in FIG. 6, and the data of each row of other column items 'weight', 'height', and 'phone' is encrypted using a key specific to each row.

And the specification explains at page 23, line 24 to page 24, line 2 that: "In the example shown in Fig. 20(a), the column items used in a retrieving process are 'name', 'state', and 'age', and the column item not to be encrypted is 'number'."

Thus, the column items are explicitly identified on pages 21-24 of the specification as, for example, "number," "name," "state," "age," "weight," "height," and "phone." That is, the column items as described in the specification are categories of data segments, in the manner of the (column) item category titles recited in amended independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42.

In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that page 21, for example, of the specification clearly refers to "each row of the column item" and "each row of other column items" (emphasis added). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that according to the disclosure in the specification the column items clearly include multiple rows.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the "column items" described in the specification clearly correspond to the (column) item category titles recited in amended independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42. And it is

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 30-42 remain finally rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of USP 5,963,642 ("Goldstein") and USP 5,915,025 ("Taguchi et al"). This rejection, however, is again respectfully traversed.

On page 3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that Goldstein discloses at least one item title for specifying a corresponding at least one data segment group as a target of a data search process at column 12, line 64 to column 13, line 3. This section of Goldstein discloses:

The present invention pertains to a method for secure storage of data. The method comprises the steps of storing semantically encrypted data in a memory. Next there is the step of performing database operations with semantically encrypted data from the memory without requiring decryption of the data. Then there is the step of obtaining data from the memory.

That is, Goldstein discloses at column 12, line 64 to column 13, line 3 that the invention described therein relates to storing semantically encrypted data and performing database operations on the data without decrypting it, and then obtaining the data.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion of Goldstein in no way relates to the features of the claimed

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

present invention (as now even more clearly recited in amended independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42) whereby all of the database data segments in the data segment group(s) that are the target of the search, as specified by a stored item category title (claims 30, 40 and 41), or that correspond to column item category titles of a first kind (claims 33, 34, 37, 39 and 42), are encrypted using a same column key, and whereby the (column) item category titles identify respective categories of the data segments.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Goldstein does not disclose performing different types of encryption on groups of data segments depending on the category (item category title) to which the data segments belong.

Still further, it is again respectfully submitted that Taguchi et al merely discloses different encryption keys are used for data of different attribute types. And it is respectfully submitted that Taguchi et al does not at all disclose, teach or suggest encrypting data segments row-by-row using different row keys, if the data segments form a data segment group(s) corresponding to item category titles other than the stored item category titles (a data segment group that is not specified as a search target in accordance with a stored item category title), or if the data segments are in data segment groups corresponding to column item category titles of a second kind, whereby the

Application No. 09/670,424  
Amendment filed with RCE

Customer No. 01933

(column) item category titles identify respective categories of the data segments, in the manner of the present invention as recited in clarified amended independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in clarified amended independent claims 30, 33, 34, 37 and 39-42, as well as claims 31, 32, 35, 36 and 38 respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over the combination of Goldstein and Taguchi et al under 35 USC 103.

\* \* \* \* \*

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7708  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
DH:iv  
encs.